

### REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 3 and 4 are pending in this application. Claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. patent 6,587,457 B1 to Mikkonen. That rejection is traversed by the present response as discussed next.

Independent claim 3 is herein amended to additionally recite the “upper layer” is a “Logical Link Control Adaptation Protocol (L2CAP)”. That subject matter is noted in the original specification, see for example Figure 5, element 53. Independent claim 3 also clarifies the base band communication packet is distributed to one of the plurality of buffers, and each of the plurality of buffers corresponds to a “respective service class such that each connection handle identifying the same service class is corresponded to the same buffer”. That subject matter is noted in the original specification for example in Figures 8 and 9 and the corresponding discussion thereto, see for example page 16, line 21 *et seq.* The features clarified in the claims are believed to distinguish over the applied art.

With reference to Figure 5 in the present specification as a non-limiting example, in the claimed method, for a communication packet from an L2CAP upper layer 53, in an interface HCI between the L2CAP upper layer 53 and a physical layer 52, one of multiple connection handles A-N identify a respective service class requested by the communication packet and are mapped to respective logical channels CID=1, CID=2, etc. With that structure in the claimed invention, multiple connection handles are specified in accordance with different service requests. A connection handle may be an identifier to identify a connection service. In the example shown in Figure 5 two logical channels CID=1 and CID=2 are set in the upper layer 53 and connection handles A and B corresponding thereto are mapped.

Moreover, in the claims a buffer is specified corresponding to each service class such that packets of the same service class are stored in the same buffer.

With the claimed structure the logical channels can be mapped to the connection handles so that channels requesting a same service quality can be mapped to the same connection handle. Further, different buffers can be allocated to the different service classes.

The features recited in the claims as currently written are believed to distinguish over the applied art to Mikkonen.

First, applicants respectfully submit Mikkonen does not disclose or suggest that in a host controller interface a mapping is performed for a communication packet exchanged from a Logical Link Control Adaptation Protocol (L2CAP) upper layer and one of multiple connection handles each identifying a respective service class requested by the communication packet. As discussed in the present specification, the claimed invention overcomes drawbacks in a conventional Bluetooth network in which an upper layer is a logical link control adaptation protocol (L2CAP).<sup>1</sup> Mikkonen is not directed to such an environment.

Further, in the claims as written base band communication packets are distributed to one of a plurality of buffers such that each of the plurality of buffers “correspond[s] to a respective service class such that each connection handle identifying the same service class as correspondent to the same buffer”. As shown for example in Figures 8 and 9 in the present specification, different connection handles that identify for example the same “Service Class a” are correspondent to the same buffer 54a, whereas different connection handles identifying “Service Classes b and c” are correspondent to different respective buffers 54b, 54c. Applicants respectfully submit Mikkonen fails to disclose or suggest that further feature.

With respect to features of mapping to buffers, the outstanding rejection cites Mikkonen at column 12, line 58 to column 13, line 10.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Specification for example at page 4, line 8 *et seq.*

<sup>2</sup> Office Action of July 3, 2008, page 4, first paragraph.

In reply to that grounds for rejection applicants submit that disclosure in Mikkonen discloses different queues can be provided for different "Internet applications". That disclosure in Mikkonen is not directed to the claimed features in which different buffers are provided for different service classes of different connection handles.

In view of the foregoing comments, applicants respectfully submit the claims as currently written positively recite features neither taught nor suggested by Mikkonen, and thus patentably distinguish over Mikkonen.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



---

Eckhard H. Kuesters  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 28,870

Surinder Sachar  
Registration No. 34,423

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/07)  
SNS/rac

I:\ATTY\SNS\219178US-AM.DOC

**CARL E. SCHLIER**  
**REGISTRATION NO. 34,426**